arXiv:1409.5275v2 [math.AG] 23 Sep 2014

ON MILNOR FIBRATIONS OF MIXED FUNCTIONS, a_f-CONDITION AND BOUNDARY STABILITY

MUTSUO OKA

Abstract. Convenient mixed functions with strongly non-degenerate Newton boundaries have a Milnor fibration ([9]), as the isolatedness of the singularity follows from the convenience. In this paper, we consider the Milnor fibration for non-convenient mixed functions We also study geometric properties such as Thom's a_f condition, the transversality of the nearby fibers and stable boundary property of the Milnor fibration and their relations.

1. Preliminary

Let $f(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ be a mixed function and write it as sum of real and imaginary part: $f = g + ih$. Writing $\mathbf{z} = (z_1,\ldots,z_n)$ and $z_j = x_j + iy_j\,(j = 1,\ldots,n)$ with $x_j, y_j \in \mathbb{R}$, the mixed hypersurface $\{f = 0\}$ can be understand as the real analytic variety in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ defined by $\{g = h = 0\}$. The real and imaginary part g, h are also (real-valued) mixed functions and we also consider them as real analytic functions of variables $\mathbf{x} = (x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1,\ldots,y_n)$. By abuse of notations we use both notations $g(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ and $g(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ etc. We recall some notations. The *real gradient vector* for a real-valued mixed function $k(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ is defined as

$$\operatorname{grad} k = (\operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} k, \operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{y}} k) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \tag{1}$$

$$\operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{x}} k = (k_{x_1},\ldots,k_{x_n}),\ \operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{y}} k = (k_{y_1},\ldots,k_{y_n}). \tag{2}$$

Here k_{x_i}, k_{y_j} are respective partial derivatives. $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ are identified by $\mathbf{z} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{z}_{\mathbb{R}} = (\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$. Under this identification, the Euclidean inner product in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ (denoted as $(*,*)_{\mathbb{R}}$) and the hermitian inner product in $\mathbb{C}^n$ (denoted as $(*,*)$) are related as $(\mathbf{z}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathbf{z}'_{\mathbb{R}})_{\mathbb{R}} = \Re(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{z}')$. For a mixed function k (not necessarily real-valued), we define also holomorphic and anti-holomorphic gradients as

$$\operatorname{grad}_{\partial} k = (\frac{\partial k}{\partial z_1},\ldots,\frac{\partial k}{\partial z_n}),$$
$$\operatorname{grad}_{\bar{\partial}} k = (\frac{\partial k}{\partial \bar{z}_1},\ldots,\frac{\partial k}{\partial \bar{z}_n}).$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14J70,14J17, 32S25.

Key words and phrases. Mixed function, a_f- condition, Milnor fibration.

For simplicity of notations, we use the following notations:

$$dk := \operatorname{grad} k,\ d_{\mathbf{X}}k := \operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{X}} k,\ d_{\mathbf{Y}}k := \operatorname{grad}_{\mathbf{Y}} k,$$
$$\partial k := \operatorname{grad}_{\partial} k,\ \bar{\partial}\, k := \operatorname{grad}_{\bar{\partial}} k.$$

Note that if k is real-valued,

$$\overline{\partial k} = \bar{\partial} k, \tag{3}$$

and real vector $dk \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ corresponds to the complex vector $2\overline{\partial k} \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

1.0.1. *Tangent spaces.* Let $k(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is a real valued mixed function. Then the tangent space of a regular point $\mathbf{a} \in V_\eta := k^{-1}(\eta), \eta \in \mathbb{R}$ is described as follows. For a complex vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we denote the corresponding real vector as $\mathbf{a}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$.

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mathbf{a}}V_k &= \{\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \mid (\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{R}}, dk(\mathbf{a}_{\mathbb{R}}))_{\mathbb{R}} = 0\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \Re(\mathbf{v}, \overline{\partial k}(\mathbf{a})) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the mixed hypersurface $V_\eta = f^{-1}(\eta)$, $\eta \neq 0$. We introduce two vectors in $\mathbb{C}^n$ which are more convenient to describe the Milnor fibration of the first type:

$$\mathbf{v}_1 := \overline{\partial f}(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}) + \bar{\partial} f(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}),$$
$$\mathbf{v}_2 := i(\overline{\partial f}(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}) - \bar{\partial} f(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})).$$

These vectors describe the respective tangent spaces at a regular point $\mathbf{a}$ of the real codimension 1 varieties

$$V_1 := \{\mathbf{z} \,|\, |f(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})| = |f(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}})|\},$$
$$V_2 := \{\mathbf{z} \mid \arg\, f(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}) = \arg \eta\}.$$

Namely, we have shown (Lemma 30,Observation 32,[9])

$$T_{\mathbf{a}}V_1 := \{\mathbf{v} \,|\, \Re(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{a})) = 0\}$$
$$T_{\mathbf{a}}V_2 := \{\mathbf{v} \,|\, \Re(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{a})) = 0\}.$$

Note that $V_\eta = V_1 \cap V_2$. Observe that the two subspaces of dimension two

$$< \bar{\partial} g(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}), \bar{\partial} h(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}) >_{\mathbb{R}}, < \mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{a}), \mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{a}) >_{\mathbb{R}}$$

are equal. In fact we have:

$$\mathbf{v}_1 = \frac{\overline{\partial f}}{\bar{f}} + \frac{\bar{\partial} f}{f} = \frac{1}{|f|^2}(f(\overline{\partial g} - i\overline{\partial h}) + \bar{f}(\bar{\partial} g + i\bar{\partial} h)) = \frac{1}{|f|^2}(2g\bar{\partial} g + 2h\bar{\partial} h)$$
$$\mathbf{v}_2 = i\frac{\overline{\partial f}}{\bar{f}} + \frac{\bar{\partial} f}{f} = \frac{i}{|f|^2}(f(\bar{\partial} g - i\bar{\partial} h) + \bar{f}(\bar{\partial} g + i\bar{\partial} h)) = \frac{1}{|f|^2}(-2h\bar{\partial} g - 2g\bar{\partial} h)$$

Proposition 1. *([8]) Put $f = g + hi$ as before. The next conditions are equivalent.*

1. *$\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is a critical point of the mapping $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$.*
2. *$dg(\mathbf{a}_{\mathbb{R}})$, $dh(\mathbf{a}_{\mathbb{R}})$ are linearly dependent over $\mathbb{R}$.*
3. *$\bar{\partial} g(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}})$, $\bar{\partial} h(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}})$ are linearly dependent over $\mathbb{R}$.*

(4) *There exists a complex number* α *with* $|\alpha| = 1$ *such that* $\overline{\partial f}(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}) = \alpha\, \bar{\partial} f(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}})$.

Under the above equivalent conditions, we say that $\mathbf{a}$ is a *mixed singular point* of the mixed hypersurface $f^{-1}(f(\mathbf{a}))$.

Lemma 2. *(cf* [3]*) Put* $V_\eta = f^{-1}(\eta)$ *and take* $\mathbf{p} \in S_r \cap V_\eta$. *Assume that* $\mathbf{p}$ *is a non-singular point of* V_η *and let* $k(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ *be a real valued mixed function. The following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) *The restriction* $k|V_\eta$ *has a critical point at* $\mathbf{a} \in V_\eta$.
(2) *There exists a complex number* $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^*$ *such that* $\bar{\partial} k(\mathbf{p}) = \alpha \overline{\partial f}(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) + \bar{\alpha} \bar{\partial} f(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}})$.
(3) *There exist real numbers* c, d *such that*
$$\bar{\partial} k(\mathbf{p}) = c \bar{\partial} g(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) + d \bar{\partial} h(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}).$$
(4) *There exist real numbers* c', d' *such that*
$$\bar{\partial} k(\mathbf{p}) = c' \bar{\mathbf{v}}_1(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) + d' \mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}).$$

Proof. As $\mathbf{p} \in V$ is assumed a non-singular point, (1) and (3) are equivalent. We show the implication (3) $\implies$ (2). Assume
$$\bar{\partial} k(\mathbf{p}) = c\, \bar{\partial} g(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) + d\, \bar{\partial} h(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}), \quad \exists c, d \in \mathbb{R}.$$
We use the equality:
$$\bar{\partial} g(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) = \frac{\bar{\partial} f(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) + \overline{\partial f}(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}})}{2}, \tag{4}$$
$$\bar{\partial} h(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) = \frac{i(\bar{\partial} f(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) - \overline{\partial f}(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}))}{2} \tag{5}$$
to obtain the equality:
$$\bar{\partial} k(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{c - di}{2} \bar{\partial} f(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) + \frac{c + di}{2} \overline{\partial f}(\mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}).$$
The implication (2) $\to$ (3) can be shown similarly, using the equality
$$\partial f = \partial g + i \partial h, \bar{\partial} f = \bar{\partial} g + i \bar{\partial} h \tag{6}$$

□

1.0.2. *Newton boundary and strong non-degeneracy condition.* Let $f(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}) = \sum_{\nu,\mu} c_{\nu\mu} \mathbf{z}^\nu \bar{\mathbf{z}}^\mu$ be a mixed polynomial. The Newton polygon $\Gamma_+(f)$ is defined by the convex hull of $\bigcup(\nu + \mu + \mathbb{R}^n_+)$ where the sum is taken for ν, μ with $c_{\nu\mu} \neq 0$. Newton boundary $\Gamma(f)$ is the union of compact faces of $\Gamma_+(f)$ as usual. f is called *convenient* if for any $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $\Gamma(f)$ intersects with z_i-axis. To treat the case of non-convenient functions, we define *the modified Newton boundary* $\Gamma_{nc}(f)$ by adding essential non-compact faces Ξ. Here Ξ is called *an essential non-compact face* if there exists a semi-positive weight vector $P = {}^t(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ such that

(1) $\Delta(P) = \Xi$ with Ξ being a non-compact face and $f^{I(P)} \equiv 0$ where $I(P) = \{i \,|\, p_i = 0\}$ and



FIGURE 1. $Non-compact face$

(2) for any $i \in I(P)$ and any point $\nu \in \Xi$, the half line starting from ν, $\nu + \mathbb{R}_+ E_i$ is contained in Ξ. Here E_i is the unit vector in the direction of i-th coordinate axis.

The weight vector P may not unique but $I(P)$ does not depend on P. Thus we denote it as $I(\Xi)$ and it is called *the non compact direction* of Ξ. See Figure 1 which shows the modified Newton boundary of $f = z_1^3 + z_2^3 + z_2 z_3^2$ in Example 3.

For any non-negative weight vector P, it defines a linear function ℓ_P on $\Gamma_+(f)$ by $\ell_P(\xi) = p_1\xi_1 + \cdots + p_n\xi_n$ where $P = {}^t(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$, $\xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n) \in \Gamma(f)$ and the minimal value is denoted as $d(P)$ and the face where this minimal value is taken is denoted by $\Delta(P)$. In other word, $\Delta(P) := \{\xi \in \Gamma_{nc}(f) \mid \sum_{i=1}^n p_i\xi_i = d(P)\}$. The face function associated by P is defined as $f_P := f_{\Delta(P)}$.

f is called *strongly non-degenerate* if (1) for any compact face $\Delta \subset \Gamma_{nc}(f)$, the face function $f_\Delta := \sum_{\nu+\mu\in\Delta} c_{\nu\mu}\mathbf{z}^\nu\bar{\mathbf{z}}^\mu$ has no critical point as a function $f_\Delta : \mathbb{C}^{*n} \to \mathbb{C}$ and (2) for a non-comact face $\Delta \in \Gamma_{nc}(f)$, $f_{\Delta_0} : \mathbb{C}^{*n} \to \mathbb{C}$ has no critical point where $\Delta_0 = \Delta \cap \Gamma(f)$.

Example 3. *Consider a holomorphic function $f = z_1^3 + z_2^3 + z_2 z_3^2$ of three variables. Note that $\Gamma_{nc}(f)$ has three vertices $A = (3,0,0), B = (0,3,0), C = (0,1,2)$ and the face $\Delta := \{\overline{AC} + \mathbb{R}_+ E_3\} \subset \Gamma_{nc}(f)$ where $\overline{AC}$ is the edge with endpoints A, C. The non-compact faces with edge $\overline{AB}$ and $\overline{BC}$ are not essential. They are not vanishing coordinates i.e., f does not vanish on $\{z_1 = z_3 = 0\}$ or $\{z_2 = z_3 = 0\}$. See Figure 1.*

2. Milnor fibration

Asume that $f(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}) = \sum_{\nu,\mu} c_{\nu\mu}\mathbf{z}^\nu\bar{\mathbf{z}}^\mu$ is a strongly non-degenerate mixed polynomial and let $V = f^{-1}(0)$. In this section, we study the Milnor fibration of f. If $f(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ has a convenient Newton boundary, the singularity is isolated and there exists a spherical Milnor fibration (= a Milnor fibrations

of the first type):

$$f/|f| : S_r - K \to S^1, \quad K = V \cap S_r$$

and also a tubular Milnor fibration (= Milnor fibration of the second type): $f : \partial E(r,\delta)^* \to S^1_\delta$ where $\partial E(r,\delta)^* = \{\mathbf{z} \in B_r \,|\, |f(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})| = \delta\}$ for sufficiently small r, δ such that $0 < \delta \ll r$. They are C^∞-equivalent (Theorems 19, 33, 37,[9]).

For non-convenient mixed function, the singularity need not be isolated. We have proved the same assertion under an extra condition "super strongly non-degenerate" (Theorem 52,[9]). In this paper, we prove the existence of Milnor fibrations for any strongly non-degenerate functions with a weaker assumption than the assumption "super". We will study also some geometric properties behind the argument.

2.1. **Smoothness of the nearby fibers.** First we recall the following:

Lemma 4. *(Lemma 28,[9]) Assume that $f(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is a strongly non-degenerate mixed function. Then there exists a positive number r_0 and δ such that the fiber $V_\eta := f^{-1}(\eta)$ has no mixed singularity in the ball $B^{2n}_{r_0}$ for any non-zero η with $|\eta| \leq \delta$.*

Proof. Though the proof is the same as that in [9], we repeat it for the beginner's convenience. We show a contradiction , assuming that the assertion does not hold. Then using the Curve Selection Lemma ([6, 4]), we can find an analytic path $\mathbf{z}(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$ such that $\mathbf{z}(0) = O$ and $f(\mathbf{z}(t),\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)) \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{z}(t)$ is a critical point of the function $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ for any $t \neq 0$. Using Proposition 1, we can find a real analytic family $\lambda(t)$ in $S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\overline{\partial f}(\mathbf{z}(t),\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)) = \lambda(t)\,\bar{\partial} f(\mathbf{z}(t),\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)). \tag{7}$$

Put $I = \{j \,|\, z_j(t) \not\equiv 0\}$. We may assume for simplicity that $I = \{1,\ldots,m\}$ and we consider the restriction $f^I = f|\mathbb{C}^I$. As $f(\mathbf{z}(t),\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)) = f^I(\mathbf{z}(t),\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)) \not\equiv 0$, we see that $f^I \neq 0$. Consider the Taylor expansions of $\mathbf{z}(t)$ and $\lambda(t)$:

$$\mathbf{z}_i(t) = b_i\, t^{a_i} + (\text{higher terms}),\ b_i \neq 0, a_i > 0, \quad i = 1,\ldots,m$$
$$\lambda(t) = \lambda_0 + (\text{higher terms}), \quad \lambda_0 \in S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}.$$

Consider the weight vector $A = {}^t(a_1,\ldots,a_m)$ and a point in the torus $\mathbf{b} = (b_1,\ldots,b_m) \in \mathbb{C}^{*I}$ and we consider the face function f^I_A of $f^I(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})$. Then we have for $j \in I$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j}(\mathbf{z}(t),\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)) = \frac{\partial f^I_A}{\partial z_j}(\mathbf{b},\bar{\mathbf{b}})\, t^{d-a_j} + (\text{higher terms}),$$
$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{z}(t),\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)) = \frac{\partial f^I_A}{\partial z_j}(\bar{\mathbf{b}},\bar{\mathbf{b}})\, t^{d-a_j} + (\text{higher terms})$$

where $d = d(A; f^I)$. The equality (7) says that

$$\overline{\frac{\partial f^I}{\partial z_j}}(\mathbf{z}(t),\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)) = \lambda(t)\,\frac{\partial f^I}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{z}(t),\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)),\ j = 1,\ldots,m.$$

which implies the next equality:

$$\mathrm{ord}_t \overline{\frac{\partial f^I}{\partial z_j}}(\mathbf{z}(t), \bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)) = \mathrm{ord}_t \frac{\partial f^I}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{z}(t), \bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)),\ j = 1, \ldots, m.$$

Thus we get the equality:

$$\overline{\partial f_A^I}(\mathbf{b}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}) = \lambda_0\, \bar{\partial} f_A^I(\mathbf{b}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}), \quad \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^{*m}.$$

This implies that $\mathbf{b}$ is a critical point of $f_A^I : \mathbb{C}^{*I} \to \mathbb{C}$, which is a contradiction to the strong non-degeneracy of $f_A^I(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$. □

2.2. **Vanishing coordinate subspaces and essentially non-compact face functions.** We assume that f is a mixed polynomial (not only mixed analytic function). We denote by $\mathcal{I}_{nv}(f)$ the set of subset $I \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ such that $f^I \not\equiv 0$ (we denoted this set as $\mathcal{NV}(f)$ in [9]). We denote by $\mathcal{I}_v(f)$ the set of subset $I \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ such that $f^I \equiv 0$, and for $I \in \mathcal{I}_v(f)$ and we consider also the set of non-compact faces $\Delta \in \Gamma_{nc}(f)$ such that there exists (possibly not unique) a non-negative weight P such that $\Delta(P) = \Delta$ and $I(P) = I$.Here $I(P) = \{i \,|\, p_i = 0\}$. $\mathbb{C}^I$ is called *a vanishing coordinates subspace*. Note that $\mathbb{C}^I \subset V$.

Definition 5. *Take an essential non-compact face $\Delta \in \Gamma_{nc}(f)$. Take a weight function P such that $f_P = f_\Delta$ and $I(P) = I(\Delta)$. We consider the function $\rho_\Delta(\mathbf{z}) := \sum_{j \in I(\Delta)} |z_j|^2$. An essential non-compact face function f_Δ is* locally tame *if there exists a positive number $r_\Delta > 0$ such that for any fixed $\{z_j \,|\, z_j \neq 0,\ j \in I(\Delta)\}$ with $\rho_\Delta(\mathbf{z}) \leq r_\Delta^2$, f_Δ has no critical points in $\mathbb{C}^{*I(\Delta)^c}$ as a mixed polynomial function of $n - |I(\Delta)|$-variables $\{z_k \,|\, k \notin I(\Delta)\}$, and we can also assume that the function ρ_Δ has no critical value on V_Δ^* on the interval $(0, r_\Delta^2]$ where $V_\Delta = f_\Delta^{-1}(0) \subset \mathbb{C}^{*n}$. We say that f* is locally tame on the vanishing coordinate subspace $\mathbb{C}^I$ *if any face function f_Δ with $I(\Delta) = I$ is locally tame. This is slightly weaker condition than "super strongly non-degenerate" in* [9].

Put $r_I = \min\{r_\Delta \,|\, I(\Delta) = I\}$ for $I \in \mathcal{I}_v(f)$ and $r_{nc} = \min\{r_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{I}_v(f)\}$. If f is convenient, $r_{nc} = +\infty$.

Remark 6. *We say that f is "super strongly non-degenrate" if we can take $r_\Delta = \infty$ in the above definition (*[9]*). For the existence of r_Δ, we used the fact that f is a polynomial.*

2.3. **Smoothness on the non-vanishing coordinate subspaces.** Take $I \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\mathbb{C}^I$ is called a non-vanishing coordinate if $f^I \not\equiv 0$. The set of such subsets I is denoted as $\mathcal{I}_{nv}(f)$. Put $V^\sharp = \cup_{I \in \mathcal{I}_{nv}(f)} V \cap \mathbb{C}^{*I}$. Then there exists a $r_0 > 0$ so that $V^\sharp$ and $V^{*I} = V \cap \mathbb{C}^{*I}$ are non-singular in the ball B_{r_0} and for any $0 < r \leq r_0$, the sphere S_r and V^{*I} intersect transversely. The existence of such r_0 is shown in Theorem 16, [9].

2.4. **Hamm-Lê type theorem.** The following is a mixed function version of Lemma (2.1.4) (Hamm-Lê,[5]). This enable us to prove the existence of Milnor fibration with locally tame behavior assumption.

Lemma 7. *Assume that $f(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is a strongly non-degenerate mixed polynomial which behave locally tamely along vanishing coordinate subspaces. Put $\rho_0 = \min\{r_{nc}, r_0\}$ where r_{nc} and r_0 are described above. For any fixed positive number $r_1 \leq \rho_0$, there exists positive numbers $\delta(r_1)$ (depending on r_1) such that*

1. *the nearby fiber $V_\eta := f^{-1}(\eta)$ has no mixed singularity in the ball $B^{2n}_{\rho_0}$ for any non-zero η.*
2. *for any $\eta \neq 0$, $|\eta| \leq \delta(r_1)$ and r, $r_1 \leq r \leq \rho_0$, the sphere S_r and the nearby fiber $V_\eta = f^{-1}(\eta)$ intersect transversely.*

Proof. We have already proved the assertion (1) (Lemma 4). So we will prove the assertion (2). Assume that the assertion is false. By the Curve Selection Lemma, we can find a real analytic curve $\mathbf{z}(t)$ and a complex valued function $\alpha(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$

$$z_j(t) = \alpha(t)\frac{\overline{\partial f}}{\partial z_j}(\mathbf{z}(t)) + \bar{\alpha}(t)\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{z}(t)),\ \forall j \tag{8}$$

where $\mathbf{z}(t), \alpha(t)$ are expanded as

$$z_j(t) = b_j t^{p_j} + (\text{higher terms}),$$
$$\alpha(t) = \alpha_0 t^m + (\text{higher terms}).$$

and $f(\mathbf{z}(t)) \neq 0$ for $t \neq 0$. Obviously $\alpha(t) \neq 0$.

Put $K = \{i \,|\, z_j(t) \not\equiv 0\}$and we consider the equality in $\mathbb{C}^K$. Put $\mathbf{b} = (b_j)$ and $P = (p_j)$, $I = \{j \in K \,|\, p_j = 0\}$, $I_1 = K - I$ and $\Delta = \Delta(P)$. In the following, we assume $K = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ as the argument is the same.

Case 1. Assume that $I \in \mathcal{I}_{nv}(f)$. Then $f^I \not\equiv 0$ and $\mathbf{b} \in V^\sharp$. We assumed that $V^\sharp$ and $S_{\|\mathbf{b}\|}$ intersect transversely for any $\mathbf{b}$, $\|\mathbf{b}\| \leq \rho_0$ and thus $S_{\|\mathbf{z}(t)\|}$ is also transverse to $V_{f(\mathbf{z}(t))}$ at $\mathbf{z}(t)$ for a small $t \ll 1$ which is a contradiction.

Case 2. Assume that $I \in \mathcal{I}_v(f)$ and so $f^I \equiv 0$. In this case, $\Delta \in \Gamma_{nc}(f)$. The above equality (8) says:

$$\begin{aligned} b_j t^{p_j} + (\text{higher terms}) = &\left(\alpha_0 \frac{\overline{\partial f_{\Delta(P)}}}{\partial z_j}(\mathbf{b}) t^{m+d(P)-p_j} + (\text{higher terms})\right) \\ &+ \left(\bar{\alpha}_0 \frac{\partial f_{\Delta(P)}}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{b}) t^{m+d(P)-p_j} + (\text{higher terms})\right), \quad j \in K. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

We compare the order in t (=the lowest degree) of the both side. The left side has order 0 and the order of the right side is at least $d + m - p_j$ for $j \notin I$ and at least $d(P) + m$ for $j \in I$. Note that $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^{*n}$. If $d(P) + m >$,

we get a contradiction $b_j = 0$ for $j \in I$. If $d(P) + m < 0$, we get

$$0 = \alpha_0 \overline{\frac{\partial f_{\Delta(P)}}{\partial z_j}}(\mathbf{b}) + \bar{\alpha}_0 \frac{\partial f_{\Delta(P)}}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{b}),\ \forall j$$

which says $\mathbf{b}$ is a mixed critical point of f_Δ, a contradiction to the strong non-degeneracy. Thus $d(P) + m = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} b_j &= \alpha_0 \overline{\frac{\partial f_{\Delta(P)}}{\partial z_j}}(\mathbf{b}) + \bar{\alpha}_0 \frac{\partial f_{\Delta(P)}}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{b}),\ j \in I \\ 0 &= \alpha_0 \overline{\frac{\partial f_{\Delta(P)}}{\partial z_j}}(\mathbf{b}) + \bar{\alpha}_0 \frac{\partial f_{\Delta(P)}}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{b}),\ j \in K - I. \end{aligned}$$

This says that the function ρ_Δ has a critical value $\|\mathbf{b}_I\|^2$ on V_Δ^*, as the gradient vector of ρ_Δ is given as

$$\bar{\partial}\rho_\Delta(\mathbf{b}) = 2\mathbf{b}_I, \quad \mathbf{b}_I = \begin{cases} b_i, & i \in I, \\ 0 & i \notin I. \end{cases}$$

Here $V_\Delta^* = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{*n} \,|\, f_\Delta(\mathbf{z}) = 0\}$. This is a contradiction on the assumption that the function ρ_Δ has no critical value on the interval $(0, \rho_0]$, as $\|\mathbf{b}\| \leq \rho_0 \leq r_\Delta/2$. □

Remark 8. *The assertion (2) also follows from a_f-condition (see Proposition 11 below.)*

2.5. **Tubular Milnor fibration.** Put

$$D(\delta_0)^* = \{\eta \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, 0 < |\eta| \leq \delta_0\},\ S^1_{\delta_0} = \partial D(\delta_0)^* = \{\eta \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, |\eta| = \delta_0\}$$
$$E(r, \delta_0)^* = f^{-1}(D(\delta_0)^*) \cap B^{2n}_r,\ \partial E(r, \delta_0)^* = f^{-1}(S^1_{\delta_0}) \cap B^{2n}_r.$$

By Lemma 4 and the theorem of Ehresman ([16]), we obtain the following description of the tubular Milnor fibration (i.e., the Milnor fibration of the second type) ([5]).

Theorem 9. (Tubular Milnor fibration) *Assume that $f(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is a strongly non-degenerate mixed function which is locally tame along the vanishing doordinate subspaces. Take positive numbers $r \leq \rho_0$ and $\delta_0 \leq \delta(r)$ as in Lemma 7. Then $f : E(r, \delta_0)^* \to D(\delta_0)^*$ and $f : \partial E(r, \delta_0)^* \to S^1_{\delta_0}$ are locally trivial fibrations and the topological isomorphism class does not depend on the choice of δ_0 and r.*

2.6. **Spherical Milnor fibration.** Consider the spherical Milnor fibration (i.e., Milnor fibration of the first kind):

$$f/|f| : S_r - K \to S^1, \quad K = V \cap S_r.$$

In the proof of the existence of the spherical fibration and the equivalence to the tubular Milnor fibration (Theorem 52, [9]), we have assumed "super strongly non-degeneracy". However this assumption is used only to prove the Hamm-Lê type assertion (Lemma 51, [9]). We have proved this Lemma with locally tameness assumption (Lemma 7). Thus we get

Theorem 10. *Assume that f is a strongly non-degenerate mixed function which is locally tame along vanishing coordinate subspaces. For a sufficiently small r, the spherical and tubular Minor fibrations exist and they are equivalent each other.*

3. Boundary stability, A_f-condition and transversality of the nearby fibers

In this section, we consider further geometric properties about mixed polynomials.

3.1. **a_f-condition.** Assume that f is a mixed polynomial and we assume that a Whitney regular stratification $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathbb{C}^n$ is given so that $V = f^{-1}(0)$ is a union of strata $M \subset V$. We says that f *satisfies Thom's a_f-condition with respect to $\mathcal{S}$* (locally at $\mathbf{0}$) if there exist positive number r and $\delta \ll r$ such that $V_\eta = f^{-1}(\eta)$ with $\eta \neq 0$, $|\eta| \leq \delta$ is smooth in B_r and any sequence $\mathbf{z}^{(\nu)}$ which converges to some $\mathbf{w} \neq \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{w} \in M$, where M is a stratum in $V \cap \mathcal{S}$ and the tangent space $T_{\mathbf{z}^{(\nu)}} f^{-1}(f(\mathbf{z}^{(\nu)})$ converges to some τ in the suitable Grassmanian space. Then $T_{\mathbf{w}} M$ is a subspace of τ. The following says that the nearby fiber's transversality follows from a_f-condition.

Proposition 11. *Assume that f satisfies a_f condition at $\mathbf{0}$ and the nearby fibers are smooth. Then there exists a $r_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < r_1 \leq r_0$, there exists a positive δ so that any nearby fiber V_η intersects transversely with the sphere S_r for $r_1 \leq r \leq r_0$ and $0 < |\eta| \leq \delta$.*

Proof. Take r_0 so that for any $r \leq r_0$, the sphere S_r intersects transversely with all strata $M \subset V$. Note that M and S_r intersect transversely if and only if for any $\mathbf{a} \in M \cap S_r$, $T_{\mathbf{a}} M$ and $T_{\mathbf{a}} S_r$ intersect transversely. That is $T_{\mathbf{a}} M \not\subset T_{\mathbf{a}} S_r$. Take a sequence of points $\mathbf{z}^{(\nu)}$ converging to $\mathbf{a} \in M \subset V$ where M is a stratum and $\mathbf{a} \neq 0$. Put $\eta_\nu = f(\mathbf{z}^{(\nu)})$ and $r_\nu = \|\mathbf{z}^{(\nu)}\|$ and $r' := \|\mathbf{a}\|$, $r_0 \geq r' \geq r_1$. Assume that V_{η_ν} intersects S_{r_ν} non-transversely at $\mathbf{z}^\nu$. Then this implies $T_{\mathbf{z}^{(\nu)}} f^{-1}(\eta_\nu) \subset T_{\mathbf{z}^{(\nu)}} S_{r_\nu}$. Assume that $T_{\mathbf{z}^{(\nu)}} f^{-1}(\eta_\nu)$ converges to τ. Then $\tau \subset T_{\mathbf{a}} S_{r'}$. On the other hand, a_f condition says that $T_{\mathbf{a}} M \subset \tau$ and $T_{\mathbf{a}} M \not\subset T_{\mathbf{a}} S_{r'}$. This is a contradiction. □

3.2. **Boundary stability condition.** Assume that $r_0 > 0$ is chosen so that $\varphi = f/|f| : S_r \setminus K \to S^1$ is a fibration for any $r \leq r_0$. We wish to consider the boundary condition $\overline{F}_\theta \supset K$ or not. This property is always true for holomorphic functions but not always true for mixed functions. For the argument's simplicity, we consider as follows. Consider the Milnor fibration in a open ball:

$$\varphi_{\leq r} = f/|f| : B_r - V \to S^1, \quad \varphi_{\leq r}(\mathbf{z}) = f(\mathbf{z})/|f(\mathbf{z})| \tag{10}$$

and put $F_{\theta,\leq r} = \varphi_{\leq r}^{-1}(e^{i\theta})$. To distinguish this fibration with usual Milnor fibration on a sphere, we call this fibration *open ball Milnor fibration.*

Definition 12. *We say the open Milnor fibration satisfies* the stable boundary condition *if* $\overline{F_{\theta,\leq r}} \supset V$ *for any* θ. *Note that the Milnor fibration in a ball is homotopically equivalent to the one on a fixed sphere* $f/|f| : S_r \setminus K \to S^1$.

Recall that a continuous mapping $\varphi : X \to Y$ is *an open mapping along a subset* $A \subset X$ if for any point $a \in A$ and any open neighborhood U of a in X, $\varphi(U)$ is a neighborhood of $\varphi(a)$ in Y. The following is an immediate consequence of the definition.

Proposition 13. *The next two conditions are equivalent.*

1. *The boundary stability condition for the Milnor fibration of* f *is satisfied.*
2. $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ *is an open mapping along* $V \cap B_r$ *for a sufficiently small* $r > 0$.

In particular, if f *is a holomorphic function, it satisfies the boundary stability condition.*

Lemma 14. *Assume that* $f(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ *is a strongly non-degenerate and locally tame along vanishing coordinate subspaces. Then the Milnor fiibration satisfies the stable boundary property.*

Proof. Take a point $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in V \cap \mathrm{Int}(\mathrm{B_r})$ and put $I = \{i \,|\, a_i \neq 0\}$.

(i) Assume that $I \in \mathcal{I}_{nv}(f)$ so that $\mathbf{a}$ is a non-singular point of V^{*I}. Then it is obvious that $\mathbf{a} \in \overline{F_\theta}$, as $\{V_\eta\}$, $|\eta| \leq \delta \ll r$ is a transversal family with the spheres $S_{r'}$ for $\|\mathbf{a}\|/2 \leq r' \leq r$ and $V_\eta \subset F_{\theta,\leq r}$ for η, $\arg \eta = \theta$.

(ii) Assume that $f^I \equiv 0$. Take an essential non-compact face $\Delta = \Delta(P)$ with $I(\Delta) = I$ and consider the face function $f_P(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$. Put f_{P,a_I} be the restriction of f_P on $z_i = \mathbf{a}_i$, $i \in I$. Thus we consider the polynomial mapping $f_{P,a_I} : \mathbb{C}^{n-|I|} \to \mathbb{C}$. As $f_{P,\mathbf{a}_I}$ is a strongly non-degenerate function for sufficiently small $\mathbf{a}_I$, there exists $\mathbf{b} = (b_j)_{j \notin I}$ such that $f_{P,\mathbf{a}_I}(\mathbf{b}) = \rho e^{i\theta}$ for some ρ. Take an arc $\mathbf{b}(s), -\varepsilon \leq s \leq \varepsilon$ so that $f_{P,\mathbf{a}_I}(\mathbf{b}(s)) = \rho e^{i(\theta+s)}$ and $\mathbf{b}(0) = \mathbf{b}$. This is possible as $f_{P,\mathbf{a}_I} : \mathbb{C}^{n-|I|} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a submersion. Consider the path:

$$(t, s) \mapsto \mathbf{b}(t, s) = (b_j(t, s))_{j=1}^n, \quad b_j(t, s) = \begin{cases} b_j(s)t^{p_j}, & j \notin I \\ a_j, & j \in I. \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{b}(t, s)) &= f_{P,\mathbf{a}_I}(\mathbf{b}(s))t^{d(P)} + (\text{higher terms}) \\ &= \rho e^{i(\theta+s)}t^{d(P)} + (\text{higher terms}). \end{aligned}$$

Take a sequence $t_\nu \to 0$. As the $\arg f(\mathbf{b}(t_\nu, s)) \to \theta + s$,we can take a sequence s_ν, $-\varepsilon \leq s_\nu \leq \varepsilon$ such that $\arg f(\mathbf{b}(t_\nu, s_\nu)) = \theta$ for sufficiently small $|t_\nu|$. For example, assume that $\arg f(\mathbf{b}(t, 0)) < \theta$. Note that $\arg f(b(t, \varepsilon)) > \theta$ as long as $t \ll 1$. Thus we use the mean value theorem to chose such a s_ν. The point $\mathbf{b}(t_\nu, s_\nu) \in F_{\theta,\leq r}$ for sufficiently small $|t_\nu|$ and it converges to $\mathbf{a}$. This implies that the closure of $F_{\theta,\leq r}$ contains V. □

3.3. **Strongly non-degenerate polynomials which is not locally tame.** (1) **Example 1**. Consider the example of M. Tibar: $f(\mathbf{z}) = z_1|z_2|^2$ ([13, 1, 2]). This is a mixed weighted homogeneous polynomial. Thus it is strongly non-degenerate. A polar weight can be $P = {}^t(1, 0)$. S^1-action is defined as $\rho \circ (z_1, z_2) = (z_1\rho, z_2)$ for $\rho \in S^1$. Then for any $r > 0$, there exists a spherical Milnor fibration: $\varphi = f/|f| : S_r \setminus K \to S^1$.

First we show that the boundary stability is not satisfied. Take a fiber F_θ. K has two components, $K_1 = \{z_1 = 0\}$ and $K_2 = \{z_2 = 0\}$. The closure of F_θ is given as $\bar{F}_\theta = F_\theta \cup K_1 \cup \{(re^{i\theta}, 0)\}$. Thus the intersection $\bar{F}_\theta \cap K_2$ is a single point $(re^{i\theta}, 0)$ and this point $(re^{i\theta}, 0)$ turns along K_2 once when θ goes from 0 to 2π. Note that K_2 is a S^1-orbit of the action. We call K_2 *a rotating axis*. The function f is not locally tame along the vanishing axis $z_2 = 0$ by Lemma 14. In fact, take a point $(a, 0) \in K_2$ and put $a = \rho e^{i\theta}$. Take an open set $U = \{z_1 \,|\, |z_1 - a| \le \varepsilon\} \times \{z_2 \,|\, |z_2| \le \varepsilon\}$ and put α be the small positive angle so that $\tan\alpha = \varepsilon/\rho$. Then the image of U by f is contained in the angular region $\{\eta \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, \theta - \alpha \le \arg\,\eta \le \theta + \alpha\}$. Thus it is not an open mapping. More precisely we assert

Assertion 15. *$\overline{F_\theta}$ is homeomorphic to* $\mathrm{Cone}(\mathrm{K}_1)$.

For example, taking $r = 1$, consider the mapping $\psi : \overline{F_\theta} \to \mathrm{Cone}(\mathrm{K}_1)$, defined by $\psi(z_1, z_2) = (1 - |z_1|, \arg(z_2))$. Here we understand

$$\mathrm{Cone}(\mathrm{K}_2) = [0, 1] \times \mathrm{K}_2/\{0\} \times \mathrm{K}_2, \quad \mathrm{K}_2 \simeq \mathrm{S}^1.$$

M. Tibar observed that f does not have any stratification which satisfies the a_f condition along z_1 axis ([11]). Put $f = g + ih$ with $g = x_1(x_2^2 + y_2^2)$ and $h = y_1(x_2^2 + y_2^2)$. Then the Jacobian matrix is given as

$$J(g, h) = \begin{pmatrix} x_2^2 + y_2^2 & 0 & 2a_1x_2 & 2a_1y_2 \\ 0 & x_2^2 + y_2^2 & 2b_1x_2 & 2b_1y_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Note that the last 2×2 minor has rank one and this makes the problem at the limit. Take a point $p = (a_1 + ib_1, 0)$. Consider the rotated mixed polynomial $\tilde{f} := (b_1 + a_1 i)f$ and write it as $\tilde{f} = \tilde{g} + i\tilde{h}$. Note that $f^{-1}(f(p)) = \tilde{f}^{-1}(\tilde{f}(p))$ and $\tilde{g} = b_1 g - a_1 h$. Then the normalized gradient of $\tilde{g}$ is given by

$$\mathrm{grad}\,\tilde{g} = (b_1, -a_1, 0, 0).$$

Put $p = (a_1 + b_1 i, z_2)$. Thus when $z_2 \to 0$,

$$T_p f^{-1}(f(p)) \subset T_p \tilde{g}^{-1}(\tilde{g}(p)) \not\supset \mathbb{C} \times \{0\}.$$

This implies, if there is a stratification which satisfies a_f-condition, the stratum of $\mathbb{C} \times \{0\}$ which contains p can not be two dimensional at $p \in \{z_2 = 0\}$. As this is the case at any point of $\{z_2 = 0\}$, there does not exist any stratification which satisfies a_f condition. On the other hand, we assert that

Proposition 16. *f satisfies the transversality condition for the nearby fibers.*

Proof. We may assume that the sphere has radius 1, by the polar homogenuity. Assume that there is a sequence $p_\nu = (u_\nu, v_\nu) \in S^3_1$ such that $f^{-1}(f(p_\nu))$ is not transverse to S^3_1 and $f(p_\nu) \to 0$. Then either $u_\nu \to 0$ or $v_\nu \to 0$ (equivalently either $|v_\nu| \to 1$ or $|u_\nu| \to 1$). We may assume that $p_\nu = \alpha_\nu \overline{\partial f} + \bar{\alpha}\bar{\partial} f$ by Lemma 2 which is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} u_\nu &= \alpha_\nu |v_\nu|^2 \\ v_\nu &= \alpha_\nu \bar{u}_\nu v_\nu + \bar{\alpha}_\nu u_\nu v_\nu. \end{cases}$$

From the first equality, we can put $u_\nu = r_\nu e^{i\theta_\nu}$, $\alpha = \rho_\nu e^{i\theta_\nu}$. The second equality says that $1 = 2\rho_\nu r_\nu$. Thus $\rho_\nu \to 1/2$ if $r_\nu \to 1$ which implies $|v_\nu| \to 2$ and $|f(p_\nu)| \not\to 0$. Assume that $r_\nu \to 0$. Then $|v_\nu|^2 = r_\nu/\rho_\nu = 2r_\nu^2 \to 0$. This is also impossible, as $|p_\nu| = 1$. □

This example shows that the transversality of nearby fibers does not implies either tameness or a_f-condition. On the other hand, tameness with strong non-degeneracy implies transversality of the nearby fibers, as we will see below.

(2) Example of A. Parusinski: $f = z_1(z_2 + z_3^2)\bar{z}_2$ ([11],see also [1, 2]). Note that f is strongly non-degenerate.

Proposition 17. *(A. Parusinski) Consider $I = \{1\}$ and note that $f|\mathbb{C}^I \equiv 0$. Then f does not satisfies a_f-condition along z_1-axis $\{z_2 = z_3 = 0\}$.*

Proof. The proof goes in the same line as that in Example 1. Consider the weight $P = {}^t(0, 1, 3)$. Then $f_P = z_1|z_2|^2$ and $d(P) = 2$. Assume that there exists a stratification $\mathcal{S}$ satisfying a_f-condition. We show the contradiction. Take a point $p = (re^{i\theta}, 0, 0)$ and assume that $p \in M$ where M is a real two dimensional stratum of $\mathbb{C}^I$. Consider the modified function $\tilde{f} = (\sin\theta + i\cos\theta)f$. Then the real part $\tilde{g}$ of $\tilde{f}$ is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g} &= \sin\theta\, g - \cos\theta\, h \\ &= (x_1 \sin\theta - y_1 \cos\theta)|z_2|^2 + \Re\,(e^{i(\pi/2-\theta)} z_1 \bar{z}_2 z_3^2) \end{aligned}$$

and the gradient vector of $\tilde{g}$ at $\mathbf{z}(t) := (p, ta_2, t^3 a_3)$ for $a_2, a_3 \in \mathbb{C}^*$ fixed is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{grad} \tilde{g}(p, ta_2, t^3 a_3) &= (\sin\theta, -\cos\theta, 0, 0, 0, 0)|a_2|^2 t^2 \\ &\quad + O(t^3). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the normalized gradient vector converges to

$$\mathbf{v} := (\sin\theta, -\cos\theta, 0, 0, 0, 0).$$

This implies that

$$T_{\mathbf{z}(t)} f^{-1}(f(\mathbf{z}(t)) \quad \subset \quad T_{\mathbf{z}(t)} \tilde{g}^{-1}(\tilde{g}(\mathbf{z}(t)) \xrightarrow{t\to 0} \mathbf{v}^\perp \quad \not\supset \quad \mathbb{C}^I.$$

This is a contradiction. □

Remark 18. *We do not know (and do not care) if $f^{-1}(\eta), \eta \neq 0$ is a transverse family for sufficiently small η.*

(3) Example 3. Consider

$$f(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}}) = z_1 k(\mathbf{z}), \quad k(\mathbf{z}) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} |z_i|^{2a_i} - \sum_{j=m+1}^{n} |z_j|^{2a_j}$$

for $2 \leq m < n$. Then f is not strongly non-degenerate but polar weighted homogeneous and it has a Milnor fibration. However it is not locally tame along the vanishing coordinate subspaces and f does not satisfy the a_f-condition. In fact the link has two components $K_1 = \{z_1 = 0\}$ and $K_2 = \{k(\mathbf{z}) = 0\}$. The component K_2 has **real codimension 1** and at any point of $K_2 \setminus K_1$, f is not open mapping and thus

$$\overline{F_\theta} = F_\theta \cup K_1 \cup \{\mathbf{z} \in S_r \mid \arg z_1 = \pm\theta\}$$

where sign is the same as that of $k(\mathbf{z})$. Thus K_2 is a rotation axis. The monodromy is the rotation arround z_1 axis:

$$h_\theta : F_0 \to F_\theta, \quad (z_1, \mathbf{z}') \mapsto (z_1 e^{i\theta}, \mathbf{z}').$$

The fiber F_θ has two components, $F_\theta^+ = \{\arg z_1 = \theta, k(\mathbf{z}) > 0\}$ and $F_\theta^- = \{\arg z_1 = -\theta, k(\mathbf{z}) < 0\}$.

Remark 19. *The function $k(\mathbf{z})$ is a real valued polynomial and the fibers $k^{-1}(\eta)$ are smooth for $\eta \neq 0$ and $k^{-1}(0)$ has an isolated singularity as a real hypersurface. However as a mixed function $k : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$, it has no regular points.*

3.4. **Thom's a_f-condition.** By analyzing above examples, we notice that the limit of two independent hyperplanes $T_p g^{-1}(g(p))$ and $T_p h^{-1}(h(p))$ may not independent when p goes to some point of vanishing coordinate $\mathbb{C}^I$, and this phenomena induces a failure of a_f condition. This problem does not occur under the tameness condition.

Theorem 20. *Assume that $f(\mathbf{z})$ is a strongly non-degenerate polynomial and assume that f is locally tame along vanishing coordinate subspaces. We consider the canonical stratification $\mathcal{S}_{can}$ which is defined by*

$$\mathcal{S}_{can} : \quad \{V \cap \mathbb{C}^{*I},\, \mathbb{C}^{*I} \setminus V \cap \mathbb{C}^I \mid I \in \mathcal{I}_{nv}(f)\} \cup \{\mathbb{C}^{*I} \mid I \in \mathcal{I}_v(f)\}.$$

Then f satisfies a_f-condition with respect to $\mathcal{S}_{can}$.

Proof. Take a point $\mathbf{q}^I = (q_j)_{j\in I} \in V \cap \mathbb{C}^{*I}$. Using Curve Selection Lemma, it is enough to check the a_f-condition along an arbitrary analytic path. So take any analytic path $\mathbf{z}(t)$ such that $\mathbf{z}(0) = \mathbf{q}^I$ and $\mathbf{z}(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{*J}$ for $t \neq 0$ with $I \subset J$ with $I \neq J$. As the argument is precisely the same, we assume hereafter that $J = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. We will show that a_f-condition is satisfied for this curve. By non-degeneracy, we may assume that $I \in \mathcal{I}_v(f)$ so that $\mathbb{C}^I$ is a vanishing coordinate. (Otherwise, p is a smooth point of V and the a_f-condition is obviously satisfied.) Consider the Taylor expansion:

$$z_j(t) = a_j t^{p_j} + (\text{higher terms}), \quad \begin{cases} p_j = 0, a_j = q_j, & j \in I \\ p_j > 0, & j \notin I. \end{cases}$$

Put $P = {}^t(p_1, \dots, p_n)$, $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, $d = d(P)$ and $\Delta = \Delta(P)$. For notation's simplicity, we assume that $I = \{m+1, \dots, n\}$. Note that

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{z}(t)) = \frac{\partial g_\Delta}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{a}) t^{d-p_j} + (\text{higher terms})$$
$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{z}(t)) = \frac{\partial h_\Delta}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{a}) t^{d-p_j} + (\text{higher terms}).$$

For simplicity, we assume that $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \cdots \geq p_m$. For a vector $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ and $1 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq m$, we consider the truncation

$$v_\alpha^\beta := (v_\alpha, \dots, v_\beta).$$

We choose $1 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq m$ as follows.

(A-1) For any $j < \alpha$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j} g_\Delta(\mathbf{a}) = 0$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j} h_\Delta(\mathbf{a}) = 0$ and $(\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_\alpha} g_\Delta(\mathbf{a}), \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_\alpha} h_\Delta(\mathbf{a})) \neq (0,0)$.

(A-2) Two complex vectors

$$(\bar{\partial} g_\Delta(\mathbf{a}))_\alpha^\beta = (\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_\alpha} g_\Delta(\mathbf{a}), \cdots, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_\beta} g_\Delta(\mathbf{a}))$$
$$(\bar{\partial} h_\Delta(\mathbf{a}))_\alpha^\beta = (\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_\alpha} h_\Delta(\mathbf{a}), \cdots, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_\beta} h_\Delta(\mathbf{a}))$$

are linearly independent over $\mathbb{R}$ and $(\bar{\partial} g_\Delta(\mathbf{a}))_\alpha^{\beta'}$, $(\bar{\partial} h_\Delta(\mathbf{a}))_\alpha^{\beta'}$ are linearly dependent over $\mathbb{R}$ for any $\beta' < \beta$. For simplicity, we use the notations:

$$v_g(t) := \bar{\partial} g(\mathbf{z}(t)) = (v_{g,1}, \dots, v_{g,m}), \quad v_h(t) := \bar{\partial} h(\mathbf{z}(t)) = (v_{h,1}, \dots, v_{g,m}).$$

We consider the order of $v_g(t) = \bar{\partial} g(\mathbf{z}(t))$ and $v_h(t) = \bar{\partial} h(\mathbf{z}(t))$. (Here the order is the lowest degree of in t.)

Suppose $\operatorname{ord} v_g = r$ and the smallest index $1 \leq i \leq m$ with $\operatorname{ord} v_{g,i} = r$ is called *leading index*. Assume that s is the leading index of $v_g(t)$. We call the coefficient of t^r in the expansion of $v_{g,s}(t)$ *the leading coefficient*. Put s' be the leading index of v_h.

For simplicity, we assume that $s \leq s'$ and if $s = s'$ we assume also $\operatorname{ord} v_g(t) \leq \operatorname{ord} v_h(t)$. This is possible by changing g and h considering $if(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$, if necessary.

First we observe that

$$\operatorname{ord} v_{g,i}(t), \operatorname{ord} v_{h,i}(t) \geq d - p_i, \quad s \leq d - p_\alpha.$$

Strategy. Put $r = \operatorname{ord} v_g(t)$, $r' = \operatorname{ord} v_h(t)$. We have three possible cases.

(1) $s' > s$ or

(2-a) $s = s'$ and the coefficients of t^r of $v_{g,s}$ and the coefficient of $t^{r'}$ of $v_{h,s}$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{R}$ or

(2-b) $s = s'$ and the coefficients of t^r of $v_{g,s}$ and the coefficient of $t^{r'}$ of $v_{h,s}$ are linearly dependent over $\mathbb{R}$.

For (1) or (1-a), we have nothing to do. In fact, write

$$v_g(t) = v_g^\infty \infty t^r + (\text{higher terms}), \quad v_g^\infty \in \mathbb{C}^n$$
$$v_h(t) = v_h^\infty t^{r'} + (\text{higher terms}), \quad v_h^\infty \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

Then the normalized limit of $v_g(t), v_h(t)$ are given by $v_g^\infty/\|v_g^\infty\|$, $v_h^\infty/\|v_h^\infty\|$. In this case, the limit of v_g and v_h for $t \to 0$ are complex vectors v_g^∞, v_h^∞ (up to scalar multiplications) which are in $\mathbb{C}^m \times \{0\}$. They are linearly independent over $\mathbb{R}$. Thus the limit of $T_{\mathbf{z}(t)} f^{-1}(f(\mathbf{z}(t))$ is the real orthogonal complement $< v_g^\infty, v_h^\infty >^\perp = v_g^{\infty\perp} \cap v_h^{\infty\perp}$ which contains $\mathbb{C}^I$.

Assume $s = s'$ and the coefficients of t^r in $v_{g,s}$ and the coefficient of $t^{r'}$ in $v_{h,s}$ are linearly dependent over $\mathbb{R}$. Then we consider the following operation.

Operation. Put $r' = \operatorname{ord} v_h$. We have assumed $r' \geq r$. Take a unique real number λ and replace v_h by $v_h' = v_h - \lambda t^{r'-r} v_g$ with $r = \operatorname{ord} v_{g,s}$, $r' = \operatorname{ord} v_{h,s}$ to kill the coefficient of $t^{r'}$ of $v_{h,s}$. (We have assumed $r \leq r'$.)

Note that after this operation, the vector $v_{h,j}'$ changes into

$$v_{h,j}'(t) = (\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j} h_\Delta(\mathbf{a}) - \lambda \varepsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j} g_\Delta(\mathbf{a})) t^{d-p_j} + (\text{higher terms})$$

where $\varepsilon = 1$ or 0 according to $r' = r$ or $r' > r$ respectively. We observe that if $r' > r$, the leading term of $v_{h,j}'(t)$ does not change. If $r' = r$, the (leading) coefficient $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j} h_\Delta(\mathbf{a})$ of t^{d-p_j} in $v_{h,j}$ is changed into

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j} h_\Delta(\mathbf{a}) - \lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j} g_\Delta(\mathbf{a}),$$

the above two properties (A-1), (A-2) are unchanged.

We continue the operation as long as the leading index of v_h' is still s. Suppose that this operation stops at k-th step. Then put $s^{(k)}$ the leading index of $v_h^{(k)}$ and $r^{(k)}$ be the order of $v_h^{(k)}$. By the above two properties, $s^{(k)} \leq \beta$ and $r^{(k)} \leq d - p_\beta$. This implies that the limit of the normalized gradient vectors v_g and $v_h^{(k)}$, say v_g^∞, v_h^∞ are independent vectors in $\mathbb{C}^m \times \{0\} = \mathbb{C}^{I^c}$ over $\mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, by the definition of the above operations,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mathbf{z}(t)} f^{-1}(f(\mathbf{z}(t)) &= v_g(t)^\perp \cap v_h(t)^\perp \\ &= v_g(t)^\perp \cap v_h'(t)^\perp = \cdots = v_g(t)^\perp \cap (v_h^{(k)}(t))^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the limit of $T_{\mathbf{z}(t)} f^{-1}(f(\mathbf{z}(t))$ is nothing but $(v_g^\infty)^\perp \cap (v_h^\infty)^\perp$. Note that $(v_g^\infty)^\perp \cap (v_h^\infty)^\perp \supset \mathbb{C}^I$. This show that the a_f-property is satisfied along this curve. □

The following will be practically useful.

Lemma 21. *Let f_Δ be a face function associated with an essential non-compact face $\Delta \in \Gamma_{nc}(f)$ with $I = I(\Delta)$. Assume that $I = \{m+1, \ldots, n\}$.*

(1) *For $f(\mathbf{z})$ a holomorphic function, the following is necessary and sufficient for f_Δ to be locally tame.*

$$(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}f_\Delta(\mathbf{z}),\dots,\frac{\partial}{\partial z_m}f_\Delta(\mathbf{z}))$$

is a non-zero vector for any $\mathbf{z}$ with $\|\mathbf{z}_I\|\leq\rho_0$.

(2) *For a mixed polynomial, f_Δ is locally tame if there exists a $j\in I^c$ such that two complex numbers $\frac{\partial g_\Delta}{\partial\bar z_j}(\mathbf{z}),\frac{\partial h_\Delta}{\partial\bar z_j}(\mathbf{z})$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{R}$. In other word,*

$$\Im\,(\frac{\partial g_\Delta}{\partial\bar z_j}(\mathbf{z})\overline{\frac{\partial h_\Delta}{\partial\bar z_j}(\mathbf{z})})\neq 0.$$

for any $\mathbf{z}$ with $\|\mathbf{z}_I\|\leq\rho_0$.

Proof. Recall that

$$\bar\partial g=\frac{1}{2}(\bar\partial f+\overline{\partial f}),\quad \bar\partial h=\frac{i}{2}(\bar\partial f-\overline{\partial f}).$$

If f is holomorphic, $\bar\partial g=\frac{1}{2}\partial f$ and $\bar\partial h_\Delta=-i\bar\partial g_\Delta$ and they are perpendicular by the Euclidean inner product. Thus they are independent over $\mathbb{R}$. For the second assertion, note that the assumption is equivalent to the 2 minor

$$\det\begin{pmatrix}\frac{\partial g_\Delta}{\partial x_j}(\mathbf{a}) & \frac{\partial g_\Delta}{\partial y_j}(\mathbf{a})\\ \frac{\partial h_\Delta}{\partial x_j}(\mathbf{a}) & \frac{\partial h_\Delta}{\partial y_j}(\mathbf{a})\end{pmatrix}=-\Im\,(\frac{\partial g_\Delta}{\partial\bar z_j}(\mathbf{a})\overline{\frac{\partial h_\Delta}{\partial\bar z_j}(\mathbf{a})})\neq 0.$$

□

3.4.1. *Examples.* Example 1. (Modification of Tibar's example) Consider the mixed monomial $f=z_1z_2^a\bar z_2$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar\partial f&=(0,z_1z_2^a),\quad \overline{\partial f}=(\bar z_2^az_2,a\bar z_1\bar z_2^{a-1}z_2)\\ \bar\partial g&=\frac{1}{2}(\bar z_2^az_2,z_1z_2^a+a\bar z_1\bar z_2^{a-1}z_2)\\ \bar\partial h&=\frac{i}{2}(-\bar z_2^az_2,z_1z_2^a-a\bar z_1\bar z_2^{a-1}z_2)\end{aligned}$$

Consider the vanishing coordinate $I=\{1\}$. Two complex numbers

$$z_1z_2^a+a\bar z_1\bar z_2^{a-1}z_2,\quad i(z_1z_2^a-a\bar z_1\bar z_2^{a-1}z_2)$$

are linearly dependent over $\mathbb{R}$ if and only if $a=1$ as

$$\begin{aligned}&(z_1z_2^a+a\bar z_1\bar z_2^{a-1}z_2)(-i)(\bar z_1\bar z_2^a-az_1z_2^{a-1}\bar z_2)\\ &=-i(1-a^2)|z_1|^2|z_2|^{2a}-ia(-z_1^2z_2^{2a-1}\bar z_2+\bar z_1^2\bar z_2^{2a-1}z_2)\\ &=-i(1-a^2)|z_1|^2|z_2|^{2a}-2a\Im(z_1^2z_2^{2a-1}\bar z_2)\end{aligned}$$

Thus the imaginary part of the above complex number is zero if and only if $a=1$. Note that f is an open mapping along $z_2=0$ if and only if $a>1$.

Example 2. Consider the mixed polynomial

$$f(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})=z_1^{a_1}\bar z_2+z_2^{a_2}\bar z_3+\cdots+z_n^{a_n}\bar z_1,\quad a_1,\dots,a_n\geq 2.$$

Then $\mathcal{I}_v = \{\{i\} \,|\, i = 1, \ldots, n\}$. Consider for example, $I = \{n\}$. Then possible face functions are

$$f_\Delta = z_2^{a_2}\bar{z}_3 + \cdots + z_n^{a_n}\bar{z}_1$$

and its face functions f_Ξ with $\Xi \subset \Delta$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\partial} f_\Delta &= (z_n^{a_n}, 0, z_2^{a_2}, \ldots, z_{n-1}^{a_{n-1}}) \\
\overline{\partial f_\Delta} &= (0, a_2\bar{z}_2^{a_2-1}z_3, \ldots, a_n\bar{z}_n^{a_n-1}z_1) \\
\bar{\partial} g_\Delta &= \frac{1}{2}(z_n^{a_n}, a_2\bar{z}_2^{a_2-1}z_3, z_2^{a_2} + a_2\bar{z}_3^{a_3-1}z_4, \ldots, z_{n-1}^{a_{n-1}} + a_n\bar{z}_n^{a_n-1}z_1) \\
\bar{\partial} h_\Delta &= \frac{i}{2}(z_n^{a_n}, -a_2\bar{z}_2^{a_2-1}z_3, z_2^{a_2} - a_2\bar{z}_3^{a_3-1}z_4, \ldots, z_{n-1}^{a_{n-1}} - a_n\bar{z}_n^{a_n-1}z_1)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(\bar{\partial} g_\Delta)_1 \cdot (\overline{\bar{\partial} h_\Delta})_1 = -\frac{i}{4}|z_n|^{2a_n}$$

and its imaginary part is non-zero which satisfies the condition of Lemma 21. Now we consider a subset $\Xi \subset \Delta$. We consider the first monomial $z_j^{a_j}\bar{z}_{j+1}$ so that

$$z_n^{a_n}\bar{z}_1, \ldots, z_{j-1}^{a_{j-1}}\bar{z}_j \notin f_\Xi, \quad z_j^{a_j}\bar{z}_{j+1} \in f_\Xi.$$

Then we have

$$\Im(\bar{\partial} g_\Xi)_j \cdot (\overline{\bar{\partial} h_\Xi})_j = -\frac{1}{4}a_k^2|z_k|^{2a_k-2}|z_{k+1}|^2 \neq 0.$$

Thus by symmetry, we conclude that f is locally tame along each vanishing coordinate axis z_k, $k = 1, \ldots, n$.

4. Some application

4.1. **Mixed cyclic coverings.** Consider positive integer vectors

$$\mathbf{a} := (a_1, \ldots, a_n),\ \mathbf{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_n)$$

such that $a_j > b_j \geq 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. We consider the mapping

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n, \quad (z_1, \ldots, z_n) \mapsto (z_1^{a_1}\bar{z}_1^{b_1}, \ldots, z_n^{a_n}\bar{z}_n^{b_n}).$$

This is a $\prod_{j=1}^n (a_j - b_j)$-fold multi-cyclic covering branched along the coordinate hyperplanes $\{z_j = 0\}$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Consider a holomorphic function $f(\mathbf{z})$ which has a non-degenerate Newton boundary and the pull-back $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}) := f(\varphi_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}))$. This give a strongly non-degenerate mixed function ([10]).

Proposition 22. *Assume that $f(\mathbf{z})$ is a non-degenerate holmorphic function which is locally tame along their vanishing coordinate subspaces. Then $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) := f(\varphi_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}))$ is a non-degenerate mixed function. Its vanishing coordinate subspaces are the same as that of $f(\mathbf{z})$ and it is locally tame along the vanishing coordinate subspaces.*

Proof. Take a face function $f_P(\mathbf{z})$ with weight $P = {}^t(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$. Consider the weight $\tilde{P}$ which is the primitive weight vector obtained by multiplying the least common multiple of the denominators of

$$ {}^t(\frac{p_1}{a_1+b_1}, \ldots, \frac{p_n}{a_n+b_n}).$$

Then $\varphi^*_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} f(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$ is radially weighted homogeneous with respect to the weight $\tilde{P}$. We observe also have $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{P}}(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) = \varphi^*_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} f_P(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$. Thus we see that the Newton boundary $\Gamma(\tilde{f})$ corresponds bijectively to that of $\Gamma(f)$ by this mapping. Suppose that $I \in \mathcal{I}_v(f) = \mathcal{I}_v(\tilde{f})$. We assume $I = \{m+1, \ldots, n\}$ for simplicity. Take a non-compact face Δ with $I(\Delta) = I$ and let $\tilde{\Delta}$ be the corresponding non-compact face of $\tilde{f}$. We consider $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{\Delta}}$ as the following composition, fixing $(u_{m+1}, \ldots, u_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{*I}$:

$$\tilde{f}_{\tilde{\Delta}} : \mathbb{C}^{*m} \xrightarrow{\varphi'_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}} \mathbb{C}^{*m} \xrightarrow{f_\Delta} \mathbb{C}$$

where

$$\varphi'_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}(w_1, \ldots, w_m) = (w_1^{a_1}\bar{w}_1^{b_1}, \ldots, w_m^{a_m}\bar{w}_m^{b_m}, u_{m+1}^{a_{m+1}}\bar{u}_{m+1}^{b_{m+1}}, \ldots, u_n^{a_n}\bar{u}_n^{b_n}).$$

As $\varphi'_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ is a unbranched covering mapping, $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{\Delta}}$ does not have any critical points. □

4.2. **Mixed functions with strongly polar weighted homogeneous faces.** We say a mixed polynomial $h(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is *mixed weighted homogeneous* if it is radially weighted homogeneous and also polar weighted homogeneous. $h(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is *strongly polar weighted homogeneous* if the polar weight and the radial weight can be the same. A mixed function $f(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is called of strongly polar weighted homogeneous face type if every face function f_Δ is strongly polar weighted homogeneous polynomial ([10]). Let $\Gamma^*(f)$ be the Newton boundary and let Σ^* be an admissible regular subdivision of $\Gamma^*(f)$ and let $\hat{\pi} : X \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be the associated toric modification. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be the vertices of Σ^* which corresponds to the exceptional divisors as in §2, [10]. Let $\mathcal{S}_I$ be the set of $|I|-1$ dimensional faces of $\Gamma(f^I)$. It is shown that $\hat{\pi} : X \to \mathbb{C}^n$ topologically resolve the mixed function $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ ([10]). Combining the existence of Milnor fibration and the argument in [10], we can generalize Theorem 11 ([10]) as follows. For $I \in \mathcal{I}_{nv}$, we denote by $\mathcal{S}_I$ the set of weight vectors which correspond to $|I|-1$ dimensional faces of $\Gamma(f^I)$.

The notations and definitions are the same as in Theorem 11 ([10]).

Theorem 23. *Let $f(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ a non-degenerate mixed polynomial of strongly polar positive weighted homogeneous face type which is locally tame along vanishing coordinate subspaces. Let $V = f^{-1}(V)$ be a germ of hypersurface at the origin and let $\widetilde{V}$ be the strict transform of V to X. Then*
(1) $\widetilde{V}$ is topologically smooth and real analytic smooth variety outside of the union of the exceptional divisors $\cup_{P\in\mathcal{V}}\hat{E}(P)$.

(2) The zeta function of the Milnor fibration of $f(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is given by the formula

$$\zeta(t)=\prod_I \zeta_I(t),\ \zeta_I(t)=\prod_{P\in\mathcal{S}_I}(1-t^{\mathrm{pdeg}(P,f_P^I)})^{-\chi(P)/\mathrm{pdeg}(P,f_P^I)}$$

where $\chi(P)$ is the Euler characteristic of the torus Milnor fiber of f_P^I

$$F_P^*=\{\mathbf{z}_I\in\mathbb{C}^{*I}\mid f_P^I(\mathbf{z}_I)=1\},\ P\in\mathcal{S}_I.$$

4.2.1. *Example: 1. Curves with mixed Brieskorn faces.* Consider a mixed polynomial

$$f(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})=z_1^2z_2^2(z_1^6\bar{z}_1^3+z_2^4\bar{z}_2^2)(z_1^4\bar{z}_1^2+z_2^6\bar{z}_2^3)$$

f is strongly non-degenerate and has two faces which are strongly polar weighted homogeneous: Put $P={}^t(2,3)$, $Q:={}^t(3,2)$. There are two faces corresponding to P and Q.

$$f_P(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})=z_1^6\bar{z}_1^2z_2^2(z_1^6\bar{z}_1^3+z_2^4\bar{z}_2^2),\ f_Q(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})=z_1^2z_2^6\bar{z}_2^2(z_1^4\bar{z}_1^2+z_2^6\bar{z}_2^3)$$

and f_P, f_Q are strongly polar weighted with $\mathrm{pdeg}\, f_P=\mathrm{pdeg}\, f_Q=20$. Thus the contribution of f_P to the zeta-function is $(1-t^{20})^{-\chi(P)/20}$ where $\chi(P)$ is the Euler characteristic of

$$F_P^*:=\{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{C}^{*2}\mid f_P(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})=1\}.$$

F_P^* is diffeomorphic to

$$F_P':=\{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{C}^{*2}\mid z_1^4z_2^2(z_1^3+z_2^2)=1\}$$

by Theorem 10 ([8]). Thus $\chi(P)=\chi(F_P^*)=-20$. Thus using the symmetry of f_P and f_Q, we get $\zeta(t)=(1-t^{20})^2$.

In general, for a non-degenerate non-convenient mixed polynomial of two variables $f(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}})$, consider the right end monomial $z_1^m\bar{z}_1^nz_2^a\bar{z}_2^b$. Right end means that $\Gamma(f)$ is in the space $\{(\nu,\mu)\mid \nu\le m+n,\mu\ge a+b\}$. If $a+b\ge 1$, z_1 axis is a vanishing coordinate. It is locally tame along z_1-axis if and only if $a-b\neq 0$.

Example 2. Consider D_n singularity:

$$D_n:\quad f(z_1,z_2,z_3)=z_1^2+z_2^2z_3+z_3^{n-1}.$$

Then the Milnor number $\mu(f)$ of f is n and the zeta function is given as $\zeta(t)=(t^{n-1}+1)(t^2-1)$. f has a vanishing axis z_2 but V is non-singular except at the origin. Consider

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{f}(\mathbf{w},\bar{\mathbf{w}})&=\varphi_{2,1}^*f(\mathbf{w},\bar{\mathbf{w}})\\&=w_1^4\bar{w}_1^2+w_2^4\bar{w}_2^2w_3^2\bar{w}_3+w_3^{2(n-1)}\bar{w}_3^{n-1}\end{aligned}$$

$\tilde{f}$ has a vanishing coordinate axis w_2 but the data for the zeta function is exactly same as f. As $\varphi_{2,1}$ is a homeomorhism, $\mu(\tilde{f})=n$ and it has the same zeta functions as f. See also Corollary 15, [10].

4.3. **Join type polynomials.** We consider the join type polynomial

$$f(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}},\mathbf{w},\bar{\mathbf{w}}) = f_1(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}}) + f_2(\mathbf{w},\bar{\mathbf{w}}), \quad (\mathbf{z},\mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^m$$

Proposition 24. *Assume that f_1 and f_2 are strongly non-degenerate mixed polynomial. Then f is also strongly non-degenerate. We assume that f_1, f_2 does not have any linear term so that they have a critical points at the respective origin. Then we have*

1. *If f_1 and f_2 are locally tame along vanishing coordinate subspaces, f is also locally tame along vanishing coordinate subspaces. In particular, f satisfies a_f condition.*
2. *If f_1 or f_2 does not satisfy a_f-condition, f does not satisfy a_f-condition.*

Proof. Assume that $I_1 \in I_v(f_1)$ and $I_2 \in I_v(f_2)$. Then $f|\mathbb{C}^{I_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{I_2} \equiv 0$. Take $\Delta_1 \in \Gamma_{nc}(f_1)$ with $I(\Delta_1) = I_1$ and $\Delta_2 \in \Gamma_{nc}(f_2)$ with $I(\Delta_2) = I_2$. Then $\Delta := \Delta_1 * \Delta_2 \in \Gamma_{nc}(f)$ and $f_\Delta(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}},\mathbf{w},\bar{\mathbf{w}}) = f_{1\Delta_1}(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}}) + f_{2\Delta_2}(\mathbf{w},\bar{\mathbf{w}})$ satisfies certainly the local tameness condition. (Here $\Delta_1 * \Delta_2$ is the convex polyhedron spanned by Δ_1 and Δ_2. Conversely suppose that $\Delta \subset \Gamma_v(f)$ with $I = I(\Delta)$. Then $f|\mathbb{C}^I \equiv 0$. Put $I_1 = I \cap \{1,\dots,n\}$ and $I_2 = I \setminus I_1$. Then $I_1 \in \mathcal{I}_v(f_1)$ and $I_2 \in \mathcal{I}_v(f_2)$. Take P so that $I(P) = I$ and put $\Delta_1 = \Delta \cap \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\Delta_2 = \Delta \cap \mathbb{C}^m$. Then $\Delta = \Delta_1 * \Delta_2$. Let P_1, P_2 be the projection to $\mathbb{C}^n$ or $\mathbb{C}^m$ respectively. Then $\Delta(P_1) = \Delta_1$ and $\Delta(P_2) = \Delta_2$ and $f_P = f_{1,P_1}(\mathbf{z},\bar{\mathbf{z}}) + f_{2,P_2}(\mathbf{w},\bar{\mathbf{w}})$ and it is certainly locally tame. This proves (1).

To prove the assertion (2), assume for example f_1 does not satisfies a_f-condition. Take stratification $\mathcal{S}$ such that its restriction to $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbb{C}^m$ are stratification $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ for f_1 and f_2 respectively. By the assumption, there exists $\mathbf{p} \in V_1 = V(f_1)$ and a stratum M of $\mathcal{S}_1$ with $p \in M$ and an analytic curve $\mathbf{z}(t)$ in $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ such that $\mathbf{z}(0) = \mathbf{p}$ and a_f condition is not satisfied along this curve. Write $f_1 = g_1 + ih_1$, $f_2 = g_2 + ih_2$ and $f = g + ih$. We may assume that

$$\bar\partial g_1(\mathbf{z}(t)) = v^\infty_{g_1} t^{s_1} + (\text{higher terms})$$

and it converges to $v^\infty_{g_1}$. We assume $\operatorname{ord} \bar\partial h_1(\mathbf{z}(t)) \geq \operatorname{ord} \bar\partial g_1(\mathbf{z}(t))$. By the same technique as in the proof of Theorem 20, we take a new vector $\bar\partial h_1' := \bar\partial h_1(t) - k(t)\bar\partial g_1(\mathbf{z}(t))$ so that

$$\bar\partial h_1'(t) = v^\infty_{h_1} t^d + (\text{higher terms})$$

so that the leading coefficient vectors v_{g_1}, v_{h_1} are linearly independent over $\mathbb{R}$. Thus the limit of the tangent space $T_{\mathbf{z}(t)} f_1^{-1}(f_1(\mathbf{z}(t))$ is given by $v^{\infty\perp}_{g_1} \cap v^{\infty\perp}_{h_1}$. By the assumption, we have that $v^{\infty\perp}_{g_1} \cap v^{\infty\perp}_{h_1} \not\supset T_{\mathbf{z}(0)} M$. Note that d is the order of $\bar\partial h_1'(\mathbf{z}(t))$. Consider the analytic path $(\mathbf{z}(t), \mathbf{w}(t))$ where $\mathbf{w}(t) = (t^{3d}, \dots, t^{3d})$. Let us consider

$$\bar\partial h_2'(\mathbf{w}(t)) := \bar\partial h_2(\mathbf{w}(t)) - k(t)\bar\partial g_2(\mathbf{w}(t)).$$

Then it is easy to see that $\operatorname{ord}\bar{\partial}g_2(\mathbf{w}(t)), \bar{\partial}h_2'(\mathbf{w}(t)) \geq 2d$. Put

$$\bar{\partial}h'(\mathbf{z}(t),\mathbf{w}(t)) = \partial h(\mathbf{z}(t),\mathbf{w}(t)) - k(t)\bar{\partial}g(\mathbf{z}(t),\mathbf{w}(t)).$$

Thus this implies that $\operatorname{ord}\bar{\partial}g(\mathbf{z}(t),\mathbf{w}(t)) = \operatorname{ord}\bar{\partial}g_1(\mathbf{z}(t))$ and $\operatorname{ord}\bar{\partial}h'(\mathbf{z}(t),\mathbf{w}(t)) = \operatorname{ord}\bar{\partial}h_1'(\mathbf{z}(t)) \geq 2d$ and the normalized limits are given as

$$\bar{\partial}g(\mathbf{z}(t),\mathbf{w}(t)) \to (v_{g_1},\mathbf{0}), \quad \bar{\partial}h'(\mathbf{z}(t),\mathbf{w}(t)) \to (v_{h_1},\mathbf{0})$$

which implies the limit of $T_{(\mathbf{z}(t),\mathbf{w}(t))}f^{-1}(f(\mathbf{z}(t),\mathbf{w}(t))$ is $(v_{g_1}^{\infty\perp} \cap v_{h_1}^{\infty\perp}) \times \mathbb{C}^m$. By the assumption, $(v_{g_1}^{\infty\perp} \cap v_{h_1}^{\infty\perp}) \times \mathbb{C}^m \not\supset T_{\mathbf{z}(0)}M$. □

References

[1] R.N. Araujo dos Santos, Y. Chen, M. Tibar. Singular open book structures from real mappings, Cent. Eur. J. Math. 11 (2013) no. 5, 817-828.

[2] R.N. Araujo dos Santos, Y. Chen, M.Tibar Real polynomial maps and singular open books at infinity, arXiv 1401.8286

[3] Y. Chen. Ensembles de bifurcation des polynômes mixtes et polyèdres de Newton, Thèse, Université de Lille I, 2012.

[4] H. Hamm. Lokale topologische Eigenschaften komplexer Räume. *Math. Ann.*, 191:235–252, 1971.

[5] H. A. Hamm and D. T. Lê. Un théorème de Zariski du type de Lefschetz. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 6:317–355, 1973.

[6] J. Milnor. *Singular points of complex hypersurfaces*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, No. 61. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1968.

[7] M. Oka. *Non-degenerate complete intersection singularity*. Hermann, Paris, 1997.

[8] M. Oka. Topology of polar weighted homogeneous hypersurfaces. *Kodai Math. J.*, 31(2):163–182, 2008.

[9] M. Oka. Non-degenerate mixed functions. *Kodai Math. J.*, 33(1):1–62, 2010.

[10] M. Oka. Mixed functions of strongly polar weighted homogeneous face type, arxiv 1202.2166v1.

[11] A. Pichon and J. Seade. Erratum: Milnor fibrations and the Thom property for maps $f\overline{g}$, *J. Journal of Singularities*, 7, 2013, 21–22.

[12] M. A. S. Ruas, J. Seade, and A. Verjovsky. On real singularities with a Milnor fibration. In *Trends in singularities*, Trends Math., pages 191–213. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2002.

[13] M. Tibar. Regularity of real mappings and non-isolated singularities, in: Topology of Real Singularities and Motivic Aspects. Abstracts from the workshop held 30 September - 6 October, 2012. *Oberwolfach Rep. 9 (2012)*, no. 4, 2933-2934.

[14] H. Whitney. Elementary structure of real algebraic varieties. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 66:545–556, 1957.

[15] H. Whitney. Tangents to an analytic variety. *Ann. of Math.* 81 (1965), 496-549.

[16] J. A. Wolf. Differentiable fibre spaces and mappings compatible with Riemannian metrics. *Michigan Math. J.*, 11:65–70, 1964.

Department of Mathematics
Tokyo University of Science
1-3, Kagurazaka, Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 162-8601
g E-mail: oka@rs.kagu.tus.ac.jp